REMARKS

Prior to this response, Claims 75-98 were pending in the application, with all claims rejected. By this amendment, no claims are canceled or added. Hence, Claims 75-98 are pending in the application upon entry of this response.

SUMMARY OF THE REJECTIONS/OBJECTIONS

Claims 75-78, 82, and 83 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Atsatt et al. ("*Atsatt*"; U.S. Patent No. 5,504,892) in view of Shoening et al. ("*Shoening*"; U.S. Patent No. 6,769,124);

Claims 79-81 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Atsatt* in view of *Shoening* and further in view of Guck ("*Guck*"; U.S. Patent No. 5,864,870);

Claims 84-88 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Atsatt* in view of *Shoening* and further in view of Cantrell et al. ("*Cantrell*"; U.S. Patent No. 6,119,151); and

Claims 89-98 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Atsatt* in view of *Shoening* and further in view of Guillen et al. ("*Guillen*"; U.S. Patent No. 5,701,485).

THE REJECTIONS BASED ON THE PRIOR ART

Claims 75-98 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Atsatt* in view of *Shoening* and, in the case of Claims 79-81 and 84-98, further in view of various other references as presented above. These rejections are collectively traversed, on the basis that a *prima facie* case of obviousness is not established based on *Atsatt* in view of *Shoening* because no combination of these references teaches or fairly suggests the subject matter recited in independent Claim 75.

Claim 75 recites, *inter alia*:

storing within a database and in association with a file system, a first object that defines a first method and an implementation of said first method, wherein said first object is an instance of a first object class; and

associating said first method with a first instance of a second object class that defines the properties of a file type associated with said file system, wherein the first method is not a method in said second object class

The Office Action relies on *Atsatt* for an alleged teaching of **a first instance of a second object class**, where the first instance is associated with a first method defined in a first object that is an instance of a first object class and the first method is not a method in the second object class. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that the TFile class of *Atsatt* is an instance of the TFSEntity class, i.e., that **TFile** is the **first instance** of the **second object class TFSEntity**. However, TFile is clearly not an instance of a class, but is a class itself.

Atsatt specifically refers to TFile as "the **TFile class** 88" (col. 15, line 30; emphasis added), which "is derived from the base **TFSEntity 84 class**" (col. 15, lines 30-31; emphasis added). Further, FIG. 8 and the associated description of *Atsatt* (col. 14, lines 4-12) further show that class category "File System [Entities] 74" contains the TFile class, and FIG. 9 of *Atsatt* depicts that TFile (and TDirectory) are derived from, i.e., subclasses of, the TFSEntity class. Thus, TFile is clearly not an instance of the TFSEntity class, or any other class, because TFile is itself an object class. Hence, TFile's relationship with TFSEntity is as **a subclass** of a class rather than **an instance** of a class. To one skilled in the art, **a subclass is not the same as an instance of a class.**

The teachings of *Astatt* are good examples of how to create objects that have different types of methods through the conventional inheritance of classic object-oriented programming

techniques, including sub-classing. However, that is not what occurs in the embodiment recited in Claim 75, where an instance is associated with a method that is not a method in the object class from which the instance is instantiated.

A similar issue arises with the rejection of **Claim 76**, in which the Office Action alleges that the TDirectory class of *Atsatt* is an instance of the TFSEntity class, i.e., that **TDirectory** is the **second instance** of the **second object class TFSEntity**. However, as with TFile, TDirectory is clearly not an instance of a class but is a class itself, because the TDirectory class is derived from (i.e., sub-classed from) the TFSEntity class.

Based on the foregoing, Claim 75 is patentable over the cited references of record because one skilled in the art would not find obvious nor would be able to derive the subject matter of Claim 75 from the combined teachings of *Atsatt* in view of *Shoening*. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 75 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 76-98 depend from Claim 75. Therefore, each of these dependent claims is patentable over the cited references of record for at least the same reasons as Claim 75. Furthermore, each of the dependent claims includes at least one other limitation that makes it further patentable over the references of record. However, due to the fundamental difference between Claim 75 and *Atsatt* discussed above, discussion of these additional limitations is unnecessary and is foregone at this time. However, the rejection of the dependent claims is collectively traversed, and no statements of official notice, overarching allegations of obviousness, or allegations of well-known features that may be present in the Office Action are stipulated to or admitted as prior art features, and the right to separately argue such features in the future is not disclaimed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the rejections involving Claims 76-98 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is requested.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims (75-98) are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Date: 8/7/06

John D. Henkhaus
Reg. No. 42,656

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, CA 95110-1089
(408) 414-1080
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076